

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

In re G.A., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

B206267  
(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. CK66042)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND  
FAMILY SERVICES.,

Petitioner and Respondent,

v.

GEORGE A.,

Objector and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Jacqueline H. Lewis, Juvenile Court Referee. Affirmed.

Jennifer Mack, under appointment by the Court of Appeal for Appellant.

Raymond G. Fortner, Jr., County Counsel, James M. Owens, Assistant County Counsel and Denise M. Hippach, Associate County Counsel, for Respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_

George A., the father of minor G.A., appeals from jurisdictional and dispositional orders entered after hearing. Finding no basis for a claim of error, we affirm.

## **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

G.A., the then-three-month-old son of minor A.P. and appellant George A., came to the attention of the authorities on December 8, 2006, after A.P. called 911 alleging issues relating to her own mother's behavior. A.P. and G.A. were placed together in foster care. At the detention hearing on December 13, 2006, George A.'s whereabouts were unknown.

The pre-release investigation report, dated December 18, 2006, indicated that A.P. and G.A. had left their placement without permission, and that their current whereabouts were unknown. On December 20, the court issued a protective custody warrant for G.A. The amended petition, filed on January 25, 2007, alleged, as to father,<sup>1</sup> failure to protect under Welfare and Institutions Code<sup>2</sup> section 300 subdivision (b) and sexual abuse under 300 subdivision (d), using the following language for both counts: "The child [G.A.]'s father, George [A.], sexually molested the child's mother, A.P. by engaging in sexual intercourse with the mother when the mother was fourteen years old and the father was twenty years old resulting in the mother's pregnancy and the birth of the child. Said sexual abuse of the mother by the father endangers the child's physical and emotional health and safety and places the child at risk of physical harm, damage, danger and sexual abuse."

An interim review report dated February 28, 2007, indicated that mother and G.A. still had not been located; it further reported that father had made no contact, but had a criminal history.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mother is not a party to this appeal. Subsequent to father's appeal, G.A. was returned to mother.

<sup>2</sup> All further references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

On April 12, 2007, George A. appeared in court, but mother and G.A. had not been located. George A. was found to be the presumed father and ordered to return for the next hearing. In June, police located mother at George A.'s home, but did not detain G.A.; father left with G.A. Mother later ran away from foster care, to which she had been returned. In September, father, mother and G.A. were seen at a relative's home but fled. Family members reported that mother and G.A. were at maternal grandmother's residence. On October 18, a no-bail warrant was issued for father's arrest. On November 21, father appeared in court, in custody, but refused to reveal the location of G.A. After hearing, he was found guilty of contempt of court and remanded to custody. On November 30, G.A., having been located, was in DCFS custody; father was ordered released and the protective custody warrants recalled.

A Second Amended Petition was filed on December 14, 2007, adding among other changes a new allegation under section 300 subdivision (b) as follows: "On or about 12/14/2006 the minor mother [A.P.] abducted the child, [G.A.] from the care and custody of the Department of Children and Family Services by removing the child from his foster home. Further, the minor mother [A.P.] and the twenty five year old father of [G.A.], George [A.] conspired to withhold the child, [G.A.]'s whereabouts from the Court and the Department of Children and Family Services for nearly one year. Further, the father George [A.] was found guilty of contempt as he was repeatedly dishonest with the court and failed to disclose the location of the minor mother and the child. Additionally, the minor mother [A.P.] has a history of running away and of running away with the child, [G.A.] Such conduct on the part of the parents, [A.P.] and George [A.] endangers the child's physical and emotional health and safety, creates a detrimental home environment and places the child at risk of physical harm, damage and danger."

The matter came on for hearing on December 14, and was continued for adjudication to January 29, 2008. After receiving evidence and taking testimony on that date, the court sustained the petition as to section 300 subdivision (b), on all counts, and dismissed the allegation made under section 300 subdivision (d). Both parents were permitted monitored visitation; reunification was denied to father pursuant to section

361.5 subdivision (b)(15) on the basis of his efforts to evade detention of G.A. Father timely appealed as to the finding on count b-2, and as to the denial of reunification.

## **DISCUSSION**

Father appeals only from the b-2 finding; he does not challenge the jurisdictional finding relating to his participation in the abduction of G.A., nor does he challenge the jurisdictional findings with respect to mother. Because there are unchallenged bases for dependency jurisdiction, jurisdiction is properly sustained in this case based on the substantial evidence in support of those findings. Where there is sufficient evidence to support jurisdiction on any of the grounds, we may affirm. (*In re Jonathan B.* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 873, 875-877; *In re Dirk S.* (1993) 14 Cal. App.4th 1037, 1045.) As a result, we need not address father's contention with respect to the b-2 finding; even if he were correct, jurisdiction is proper and he therefore is not prejudiced.

With respect to the denial of reunification, although father included this issue in his notice of appeal, he neither addressed it nor provided any legal authority to support an argument that the court erred. Accordingly, he has waived the issue. "[P]arties are required to include argument and citation to authority in their briefs, and the absence of these necessary elements allows this court to treat appellant's . . . issue as waived." (*Interinsurance Exchange v. Collins* (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 1445, 1448.) In any event, there was substantial evidence before the court to support the finding that father had taken an active role in hiding the child after the child had been initially detained. There is no basis for a claim of error.

## **DISPOSITION**

The findings and orders are affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

ZELON, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

JACKSON, J.